



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/865,773	05/25/2001	Aruna Rohra Suda	4233-4002	5757
27123	7590	01/18/2006		EXAMINER
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P. 3 WORLD FINANCIAL CENTER NEW YORK, NY 10281-2101			CHANNAVAJJALA, SRIRAMA T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2166	

DATE MAILED: 01/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/865,773	SUDA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Srirama Channavajjala	2166

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 July 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-15, 18-57 and 59-93 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-15, 18-57 and 59-93 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/8/05</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

THIS IS NON-FINAL OFFICE ACTION TO THE PENDING CLAIMS 1-15,18-57,59-93

1. In view of the appeal Brief filed on 7/7/2005, **PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED**. A new rejection to the pending claims 1-18 is set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

- (1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,
- (2) request reinstatement of the appeal.

If reinstatement of the appeal is requested, such request must be accompanied by a supplemental appeal brief, but no new amendments, affidavits (37 CFR 1.130, 1.131 or 1.132) or other evidence are permitted. See 37 CFR 1.193(b)(2).

2. In view of applicant's response to notification of non-complaint appeal brief filed on 07 July 2005, examiner hereby withdrawn "Final-Office action" mailed on 11/22/2004.
3. Claims 1-15,18-57,59-93 are pending in this application.
4. Claims 16-17,58 are cancelled, see paper filed on 6/15/2004
5. Claims 80-93 have been added, see paper filed on 6/15/2004
6. In view of the applicant proper number form of the claims, the claim objections set forth in the previous office action is hereby withdrawn.

Drawings

7. Examiner acknowledges applicant substituted drawings fig
6,10,24,35,31,32,34,35,37-41,85,89 acceptable for examination purpose, filed on
6/15/2004.

Priority

8. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority based on an application Serial No. 2000-197293, 2000-248999, 2000-314601, filed in JAPAN on 5/29/2000, 7/7/2000, 10/16/2000 respectively. Examiner acknowledges applicant submitted certified copy of the 2000-197293, 2000-248999, 2000-314601 applications as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b).

Information Disclosure Statement

9. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 03/08/2005 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner, a copy of PTO-1448 is enclosed with this office action.

10. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 9/25/2001, paper no. # 3; 4/11/2002, paper no. # 4; 12/8/2003, paper no. # 5; 8/28/2003, paper no. # 6 respectively acknowledged. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner, a copy of PTO-1448 is enclosed with this office action, paper no. # 7.

Double Patenting

11. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

12. *Claims 1-15,18-57,59-93 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-58 of co pending Application No. 09/938,866, filed on 8/24/2001, claims 1-42 of application 10/116,932 filed on 4/5/2002, claims 1-37 of application*

***10/117,514 filed on 4/5/2002, 1-51 of application 10/387,002 filed on 3/12/2003,
1-42 of application 10/387,005 filed on 3/12/2003 .***

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the referenced copending applications and would be covered by any patent granted on that copending applications since the referenced copending applications and the instant applications are claiming similar, common subject matter. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because in the present application Independent Claims 1,59-60,80,93 are directed to data processing system setting means for setting a condition for web page...data acquisition means for acquiring web page data; determination means for determining whether the acquired web page data....indexing means for assigning a predetermined index to web page data....saving means for saving the web page data....[claim 1,59-60,93], extracting data within a predetermined meta tag ...displaying, when the retrieved web page.... [claim 80] ; while co-pending Application No. 09/938,866, independent Claims 1,24 are directed to a data processing apparatus comprising means for initiating saving....saving one of either an internet page content displayedURL of the page; means for acquiring....initiating saving;, means for indexing.....predetermined index to data....means for data saving acquired data....predetermined storage unit.

Co-pending application no. **10/116,932** independent claims 1,34-42 directed to information processing systemreceiving means for receiving information....internet; transmission mens....client terminals, ...server information.....display means for displaying.....

Art Unit: 2166

Co-pending application no. **10/117,514** independent claims 1,19,37 directed to information processing....information obtaining means for obtaining information; template selection means.....extraction means for extracting data....saving means for saving data.....

Co-pending application no. **10/387,002** independent claims 1,36,43,46-47,50-51 directed to information processing methodobtaining a processing instruction from a displayed web page, transferring theprocessing instruction.

Co-pending application no. **10/387,005** independent claims 1,27,38-42 directed to a data processing method comprising...obtaining data displayed by a browser, importing data without displaying the data, storing and managing the obtained data.....

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of data processing at the time the invention was made to modify the cited steps as indicated copending **09/938,866**, independent Claims 1,24 , application **10/116,932** independent claims 1,34-42, **10/117,514** independent claims 1,19,37, **10/387,002** independent claims 1,36,43,46-47,50-51, **10/387,005** independent claims 1,27,38-42, since the omission and addition of the cited limitations would have not changed the process according to which the data processing web page related data, particularly would perform the same function of managing web page related data . In re Karlson, 136 USPQ 184 (CCPA 1963). Accordingly, the instant Claims are broad and within the scope of the Claims of copending applications.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

13. *Claims 59,93 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. In each claim, there is no claimed storage medium on which the computer readable program is tangible embodied.*

14. As noted in MPEP 2106: "Such claimed computer programs do not define any structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and other claimed elements of a computer which permit the computer program's functionality to be realized. In contrast, a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a computer program is a computer element which defines structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and the rest of the computer which permit the computer program's functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory" and "[s]ince a computer program is merely a set of instructions capable of being executed by a computer, the computer program itself is not a process and Office personnel should treat a claim for a computer program, without the computer-readable medium needed to realize the computer program's functionality, as nonstatutory functional descriptive material."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

15. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

16. ***Claims 1-3,13,15, 21-44,47-57, 59-63,71,77,79,93 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Peterson et al. [hereafter Peterson], US Patent No. 6594682 filed on Oct 28, 1997 and printed on July 15, 2003.***

17. As to Claims 1,50, 59-60,93, Peterson teaches a system which including 'setting means for setting a condition for web page data to be saved, in advance of acquiring the web page data' [col 11, line 52-56], Peterson teaches filtration rules, preferences saved in advance before retrieving web content as detailed in col 11, line 52-56; 'data acquisition means for acquiring web page data' [fig 6, col 10, line 55-56], 'acquiring web page data' corresponds to Peterson's fig 6;

'determination means for determining whether the acquired web page data satisfies the condition' [col 11, line 57-60]

'indexing means for assigning a predetermined index to the web page data if the web page data is determined to satisfy the condition' [col 11, line 25-26, line 39-46], index corresponds to fig 1, element 30;

'index dynamically assigned to the web page data' [col 11, line 33-35]

'saving means for saving the requested web page data determined to satisfy the condition and the assigned index in a predetermined storage unit' [col 9, line 53-54, line 60-62, fig 1, element 28], saving the requested web page data corresponds to storing the web content as detailed col 9, line 60-62

18. As to Claim 2, Peterson teaches a system which including 'acquisition means acquires data from a browser client, said browser client allowing browsing of data in an Internet' [see fig 1, fig 8,col 4, line 17-19].

19. As to Claim 3, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 1 above. In addition, Peterson disclosed 'predetermined storage is a database' [col 13, line 8-11], 'system further comprising data retrieving means for retrieving data from the database based on a user-supplied index, said user-supplied index specified by a user' [col 4, line 47-52, col 11, line 25-26].

20. As to claim 13, Peterson disclosed 'indexing means acquires a URL of the data from the browser as the index' [col 3, line 33-35, col 4, line 53-55].

21. As to claim 15, Peterson disclosed 'each group corresponds to a network session' [col 8, line 60-63].
22. As to claim 21, Peterson disclosed 'comparing means for comparing the effective period with a current time at a predetermined timing' [col 11, line 8-11]; 'removal means for removing data in correspondence with the effective period before the current time based upon the result of a comparison by said comparing means' [col 11, line 30-33, col 12, line 25-26]..
23. As to claim 22, Peterson disclosed 'predetermined timing is a time when the system accepts no operations by a user' [col 12, line 35-37].
24. As to claim 23-24, Peterson disclosed 'removal means request a user to confirm the removal of the data and removes the confirmed data' [col 12, line 25-26].
25. As to claim 25, Peterson disclosed 'saving means saves the data in correspondence with a non-limited effective period' [col 12, line 44-47].
26. As to claim 26-30, Peterson disclosed 'saving means saves the browsed data in a first save mode and saves a URL for the browsed data in place of the browsed data in a second save mode' [col 12, line 10-15].

27. As to claim 31, Peterson disclosed 'index extracting means for extracting as an index a specific data from a data train constituting address of the browsed data in the network on the basis of a predetermined rule' [col 11, line 30-38].
28. As to claim 32-33, Peterson disclosed 'specific data is a domain name' [col 9, line 39-41, line 60-63].
29. As to claim 34-36, Peterson disclosed 'specific data is a name of organization' [col 7, line 6-14, col 10, line 9-16].
30. As to claim 37, Peterson disclosed 'sending means for sending the acquired data or a specific part thereof to a destination' [fig 1, fig 8].
31. As to claim 38, Peterson disclosed 'specific part is a URL of the saved data' [col 9, line 25-28].
32. As to claim 39, Peterson disclosed 'specific part is the save data except for an embedded image' [col 10, line 60-63].
33. As to claim 40-42, Peterson disclosed 'editing means editing browsed data' [col 10, line 22-24, col 11, line 66-67, col 12, line 1-3].

34. As to claim 43, Peterson disclosed 'editing means includes changing means for changing a display form of a designated portion in the browsed data' [col 11, line 45-47].
35. As to claim 44, Peterson disclosed 'extraction means for extracting a predetermined type of data from the browsed data' [col 11, line 25-26]; 'extracted data saving means for saving the extracted data in the database' [col 11, line 26-29].
36. As to claim 47-48, Peterson disclosed 'data requested to be saved includes data in other URL, said saving means downloads the include data from the other URL' [col 9, line 39-41].
37. As to claim 49, Peterson disclosed 'selection means for selecting an automatic save mode, and in the automatic save mode, said determination means always determines the user requests to save the browsed data without instruction for each of the browsed data' [col 10, line 65-67, col 11, line 1-2].
38. As to claim 51, Peterson disclosed 'data acquisition means in said server apparatus acquires data in an Internet' [fig 1, fig 8].
39. As to claim 52-57, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 50 above, in additional, Peterson disclosed distribution system that supports, provides web content information as detailed in fig 1, fig 8, especially web servers,

element 22, client system element 24 and database element 28, index element 30

[see fig 1].

40. As to claim 61, Peterson disclosed 'predetermined index is dynamically generated' [col 10, line 29-32].

41. As to claim 62, Peterson disclosed predetermined storage unit is a database' [col 9, line 53-56].

42. As to claim 63, Peterson disclosed 'retrieving data from said database based on a user-supplied index' [col 11, line 25-26].

43. As to claim 71, Peterson disclosed 'data is acquired from a browser client, said browser client allowing browsing of data in an internet' [col 12, line 62-67]

44. As to claim 77, Peterson disclosed 'extracting a predetermined type of data from the browsed data' [col 11, line 50-52]; 'saving the extracted data in the storage unit' [col 11, line 66-67, col 12, line 1-3].

45. As to claim 79, Peterson disclosed 'index includes a time when the data is saved' [col 11, line 19-21]; 'node creation means for creating nodes corresponding to groups classified on the basis of the timing of saving, said node creation means creates a

hierarchiy of nodes by dividing a group corresponding to a period into a plurality of sub group each corresponding to a shorter period and creating a node corresponding to each of sub group' [col 12, line 16-23]; 'node displaying means for displaying a plurality of nodes created by said node creation means in an order of saving' [col 12, line 10-12].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

46. *Claims 4,7-8, 64-70, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson et al. [hereafter Peterson], US Patent No. 6594682 filed on Oct 28, 1997 and printed on July 15, 2003 in view of Broder et al. [hereafter Broder], US Patent No. 6073135 filed on Mar 10, 1998.*

47. As to claim 4, 64, Peterson disclosed indices of the data in the storage unit' [col 4, line 47-49], 'display means for displaying a result' [fig 6, col 8, line 14-15]. It is however, noted that Peterson does not specifically teach 'sorting means for sorting indices of the data'. On the other hand, Broder disclosed 'sorting means for sorting indices of the data' [col 3, line 57-63, fig 3].

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Broder into scheduling delivery of web content and locally managing the web content of Peterson because both Broder and Peterson are directed to web contents, more specifically, client-server environment of internet web [see Broder: fig 1; Peterson: fig 1, fig 8], and both Broder and Peterson specifically directed to navigating or browsing web pages [see Broder: Abstract; Peterson: col 8, line 46-53].

one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Broder into scheduling delivery of web content and locally managing the web content of Peterson because that would have allowed users of Peterson to provide linkage information for a significant portion of the web, and ranking web pages [Broder: col 5, line 63-66], bringing the advantages of web visualization and navigation tools, optimize the design and implementation of web crawlers based on statistics derived from the various nodes [col 6, line 1-6].

48. As to Claim 5, 65, 68, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 4 above. In addition, Broder disclosed 'sorting means performs the sorting based on a plurality of types of indices' [Abstract, fig 1, element 141, col 3, line 57-60].

49. As to Claim 6, 66, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 4, above. In addition, Peterson disclosed 'selecting means for selecting an index from the indices displayed on said display means' [col 6, line 58-60, col 9, line 31-32]; 'retrieval means for retrieving data corresponding to the index selected by said selecting means from the database' [col 9, line 53-54].

50. As to Claim 7, 67, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 4, above. In addition, Peterson disclosed 'deleting means for deleting at least one index from the indices displayed on said display means, removal means for removing data corresponding to the index deleted by said deleting means from the database' [col 10, line 29-33].

51. As to Claim 8, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 4, above. In addition, Broder disclosed 'at least one of the data has a plurality of values for an index, and said sorting means places the plurality of values at positions corresponding to respective values' [col 4, line 36-42, col 5, line 5-7, fig 4].

52. As to claims 69-70, Peterson disclosed 'sending the acquired data to a predetermined destination' [col 12, line 44-57, fig 1, fig 8].

53. ***Claims 9-12,14,18-20,45-46, 72-76,78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson et al. [hereafter Peterson], US Patent No. 6594682 filed on Oct 28, 1997 and printed on July 15, 2003 in view of Bates et al. [hereafter Bates], US Patent No. 6100890 filed on Nov 25, 1997***

54. As to claim 9, Peterson disclosed 'browsing web content or data as detailed in Abstract. It is however, noted that Peterson does not teach 'folder creation means for creating a new folder for newly browsed data', file name assigning means for assigning a predetermined name to the newly browsed data without intervention by a user', 'file saving means for saving the newly browsed data in the new folder with the assigned file name'. On the other hand, Bates disclosed folder creation means for creating a new folder for newly browsed data' [col 9, line 35-38, file name assigning means for assigning a predetermined name to the newly browsed data without intervention by a user[col 9, line 3-15], fig 7', 'file saving means for saving the newly browsed data in the new folder with the assigned file name' [col 11, line 23-27].

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Bates et al. into scheduling delivery of web content and locally managing the web content of Peterson because both Peterson and Bates are directed to web page content managing, more specifically Peterson is directed to gathering, organizing of web content in a client-server based system [see Abstract], while Bates is directed to managing browsed web pages based

on user matching criteria [see Abstract], both Peterson, Bates teach internet browser where user searches web page contents.

One of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Bates et al. into scheduling delivery of web content and locally managing the web content of Peterson because that would have allowed Peterson to use "bookmark" list, although Peterson's browser also supports bookmaking, particularly manually choosing web page that are stored in the bookmark, feature, however, Bates improving bookmarks to browsed pages automatically based on selection criteria and matching words in the viewed page, but also automatically catalogs the bookmark list entries into folders based on matching words in the viewed page to the keywords and the synonym list [see Bates: col 2, line 43-52], thus improving the quality and reliability of the browsing web page contents.

55. As to claim 10, 72,Bates disclosed 'folder creation means creates the new folder with a folder name created based on a predetermined rule' [col 11, line 42-48].

56. As to claim 11, 73-74, Bates disclosed 'folder name is a fixed name' [col 11, line 1-3].

57. As to claim 12, Bates disclosed 'file name generation means for generating a unique file name for the newly browsed data without intervention by a user' [col 12, line 33-40]; 'file saving means for saving the newly browsed data with adding the generated file name' [col 12, line 41-46].

58. as to claim 14, Bates disclosed 'indexing means acquires at least one of a keyword or a title embedded in the data from the browser as the index' [col 13, line 14-24].

59. As to claim 18, Bates disclosed 'word assigning means for assigning a word specified by a user as a further index to the data to be saved by said saving means' [col 14, line 27-38].

60. As to claim 19-20, Bates disclosed 'if an index assigned to the data to be saved has been assigned to other data, said saving means saves the data as a new data or updates the other data according to a setting by the user' [col 9, line 24-29].

61. As to claim 45, Bates disclosed 'extraction means extracts data in a predetermined column in response to a copying operation of data from a specified portion of the browsed data to the predetermined column, and said extracted data saving means saves the extracted data with an attribute corresponding to the predetermined column' [col 12, line 33-47].

Art Unit: 2166

62. As to claim 46, Bates disclosed 'predetermined type of data includes at least one of an organization name, a person name, an E-mail address, a telephone number, a Fax number and a keyword appended to the data' [col 4, line 34-42].

63. As to claims 75-76, Peterson disclosed 'editing means editing browsed data' [col 10, line 22-24, col 11, line 66-67, col 12, line 1-3].

64. As to claim 78, Bates disclosed 'indexing means displays the keyword or the title acquired from the browser' [col 9, line 58-61].

65. *Claims 80-92 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Singhal US Patent No. 6370527 filed on Dec 29, 1998.*

66. As to claim 80, Singhal teaches a system which including 'extracting data within a predetermined meta tag from a web page retrieved by a browser' [col 2, line 35-37, col 3, line 57-59, col 4, line 1-4, col 5, line 1-4, line 16-24, line 44-47], Singhal is directed to meta-search engine, particularly extracting search terms, titles and occurrence of the search terms that corresponds to predetermined meta tag from multiple listings;; 'displaying, when the retrieved web page is displayed in an area, the extracted data in a predetermined field outside of the area' [fig 2, col 2, line 39-42].

67. As to claim 81, Singhal disclosed 'saving the displayed web page in a storage unit in correspondence with the data displayed in the predetermined field as an index'[col 2, line 66-67, col 3, line 1-3, line 30-32].

68. As to claim 82, Singhal disclosed 'predetermined meta tag is that of a keyword for the web page' [col 4, line 13-17].

69. As to claim 83, Singhal disclosed 'predetermined meta tag is that of a title for the web page' [col 5, line 1-4].

70. As to claim 84, Singhal disclosed 'displaying a list of indices for web pages saved in the storage unit' [col 6, line 30-32]; 'receiving from a user a designation of an index in the displayed list of indices' [col 6, line 29-37]; 'displaying the web page corresponding to the designated index' [col 6, line 61-65].

71. As to claim 85, Singhal disclosed 'list of indices is displayed in another area when the retrieved web page is displayed in the area' [see fig 2].

72. As to claim 86, Singhal disclosed 'sorting the list of indices, and displaying the sorted list of indices' [col 4, line 54-57].

73. As to claim 87, Singhal disclosed 'editing the displayed web page' [fig 2,], particularly displayed page allows various menu functions that including Edit.

74. As to claim 88, Singhal disclosed 'annotation is added to the displayed web pae' [col 4, line 41-44].

75. As to claim 89-91, Singhal disclosed 'sending the displayed web page or a part thereof to a specified destination' [col 3, line 17-20].

76. As to claim 92, Singhal disclosed 'a URL of the displayed web page is saved instead of the web page in said saving step' [col 3, line 30-32].

Response to Arguments

77. Applicant's arguments filed on 7/7/2005 with respect to claims 1-15,18-57,59-93 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of new rejection as stated above.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record

- a. US Patent No. 6594682
- b. US Patent No. 6073135
- c. US Patent No. 6100890
- d. US Patent No. 6370527

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Srirama Channavajjala whose telephone number is 571-272-4108. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alam, Hosain, T, can be reached on (571) 272-3978. The fax phone numbers for the organization where the application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free)

sc
Patent Examiner. 
January 12, 2006.


Alam, Hosain, T
SPE, AU2166.